



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/729,495	12/04/2000	Yu-Suk Yun	678-570(P9574)	3333

7590

06/15/2004

Paul J. Farrell
Dilworth & Barrese, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, NY 11553

EXAMINER

TRAN, THIEN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2665

5

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/729,495

Applicant(s)

YUN ET AL.

Examiner

Thien D Tran

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8-13 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being participated by Odenwalder et al (U.S Patent No. 6,298,051 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Odenwalder discloses a method for assigning orthogonal codes used for a in-phase channel set 90 (first system) and a quadrature-phase channel set 92 (second system) in a CDMA, col.3 lines 60-65, system including channels of the first system for spreading a pilot signal, a sync signal, a paging signal and a traffic signal with orthogonal codes, col.4 lines 10-50, corresponding to a first set of one or more orthogonal code numbers in different rows from a set of orthogonal

codes arranged in a matrix of m rows and m columns, figures 4, and channels of the second system for spreading orthogonal codes corresponding to a second set of one or more orthogonal code numbers different from said first set of one or more orthogonal code numbers, comprising the steps of:

assigning orthogonal codes corresponding to the orthogonal code numbers of the orthogonal code set associated with at least one of $2n$ rows to the channels of the first system, wherein a set of the orthogonal codes are arranged in a matrix of subsets of orthogonal codes and inversed orthogonal codes, each subset including $2n$ rows and $2n$ columns, figures 4; and

assigning orthogonal codes corresponding to the orthogonal code numbers of the orthogonal code set associated with at least one of the remaining rows to the channels of the second systems, col.7 lines 25-30.

Regarding claim 3, Odenwalder discloses that the orthogonal codes assigned to the first system are Walsh codes of length 64 and the orthogonal codes assigned to the second system are Walsh codes having a length shorter than a length of the Walsh codes of the first system, col.7 lines 30-55.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odenwalder et al (U.S Patent No. 6,298,051 B1) in the view of Holtzman et al (U.S Patent No. 6,621,804).

Regarding claim 2, Odenwalder discloses that the first system is a CDMA-IS95 system and the second system is an HDR (High Data Rate) system. Odenwalder does not disclose the first system being CDMA2000. However, Holtzman discloses the feature of controlling power for fundamental channels in higher data rate in cdma 2000, col7 lines 55-65. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the feature of HDR of Odenwalder used in IS95 to modify the next generation CDMA2000 to achieve higher data rate in multimedia.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 4-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Claims 8-13 are allowed

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Thien Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-4388. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

Art Unit: 2665

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached on (703) 305-4744. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Thien Tran



STEVEN NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER